DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 085 CS 509 847

AUTHOR Siddens, Paul J., III
TITLE An Investigation of the Amount of Emphasis Placed on Content and Delivery by Instructors of Public Speaking.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association (Chicago, IL, April 2-5, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; Persuasive Discourse; Pilot Projects; *Public Speaking; Questionnaires; Research Methodology; *Student Evaluation; Teacher Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Self Report Measures; *Teacher Awareness; Teaching Research; University of Iowa; University of Northern Iowa

ABSTRACT

A study examined how much emphasis instructors of public speaking place on content and delivery when teaching and delivering oral and written critiques. The study sought to determine whether when teaching a hybrid introduction to communication course, or public speaking course, instructors are challenged with teaching their students about issues related to the content of the speech, such as the introduction and conclusion, organization, supporting evidence, and issues related to physical and vocal delivery such as appearance, gestures, eye contact, volume, rate, and vocal variety. This was a pilot study to test the research questions, survey instrument, and methodology used in the study. A survey questionnaire was administered to graduate teaching assistants and faculty members at the University of Iowa (100 questionnaires) and the University of Northern Iowa (40 questionnaires). Results indicated that instructors spend a greater than average amount of time on the topic of organizational patterns and a less than average amount of time on the topics of dress and appearance, facial expressions, gestures, physical movement, and posture when giving oral critiques, with eye contact being the exception. Findings suggest that instructors consistently spend a less than average amount of time on physical and vocal delivery related topics when giving written critiques. (Appended are 13 pages of study results and a sample questionnaire.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 085

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON CONTENT AND DELIVERY BY INSTRUCTORS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING

Paul J. Siddens III, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Communication Studies
Communication Studies Department
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0357
319-273-5898
Paul.Siddens@UNI.EDU

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

P. Siddens, III

1

Research Paper presented at the
Central States Communication Association Conference
Chicago, IL; April. 1998

CS509847

Special Note: I wish to acknowledge, and extend my thanks to, my colleague Valerie Peterson, of the University of Iowa, for her assistance in distributing and collecting survey questionnaires at that institution.

Introduction/Purpose of the Study

Whether teaching a hybrid introduction to communication course, or public speaking course, instructors are challenged with teaching their students about issues related to the content of the speech, such as the introduction and conclusion, organization, supporting evidence, etc., and issues related to physical and vocal delivery such as appearance, gestures, eye contact, volume, rate, vocal variety, etc. Further, we have the opportunity to teach our students about these topics in class room lectures and discussion, and in oral and written critiques that we provide our students after they actually perform their speeches.

When considering these different areas related to teaching our students public speaking, it is interesting to consider where instructors of public speaking place their emphasis; on content issues or delivery issues.

This study examines how much emphasis instructors of public speaking place on content and delivery when teaching, and delivering oral and written critiques. This is a pilot study to test the research questions, survey instrument, and methodology used in the study.

Research Questions

The research questions asked in this study are:

RQ1: Do instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content or delivery when teaching?

RQ2: Do instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content or delivery when delivering oral critiques to their students?

RQ3: Do instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content or delivery when delivering written critiques to their students?

RQ4: Do the perceptions of public speaking instructors regarding how much emphasis they place on content and delivery match the actual emphasis that they place on content and delivery?

Procedure and Methodology

Procedure

A survey questionnaire was constructed to answer the research questions asked in this study. A copy of the survey questionnaire can be found in the appendix of this paper. Because this is a pilot study it was decided to limit the distribution of survey questionnaires to two four year institutions with communication departments and graduate programs.

The survey questionnaire was administered to graduate teaching assistants and faculty members at the University of Iowa and the University of Northern Iowa. 100 questionnaires were distributed to instructors at the University of Iowa, and 40 questionnaires were distributed to instructors at the University of Northern Iowa. 28 survey questionnaires were returned for a return rate of 20%.

The data was analyzed quantitatively, by comparing mathematical percentages to one another within the categories investigated by the survey questionnaires.

Subjects/Demographic Information

The participants in this study are profiled through the demographic information provided in summary tables 1 through 6.

Item 1 asked the academic status of the participants. The results of this item are found in Summary Table 1.

Summary Table 1
Academic Status of Participants

Masters students	4	14%
Ph.D. students	14	50%
Part-time faculty members	1	04%
Full-time faculty members	9	32%
	28	100%

Item 2 asked the academic rank of the participants. The results of this item are found in Summary Table 2.

Summary Table 2
Academic Rank of Participants

Graduate Teaching Assistants	18	63%
Instructors or Adjuncts	1	04%
Assistant Professors	3	11%
Associate Professors	5	18%
Full Professors	1	04%
	28	100%

Item 3 asked the tenure status of the participants. The results of this item are found in Summary Table 3.

Summary Table 3
Tenure Status of Participants

Untenured	21	75%
Tenured	7	25%
	28	100%

Item 4 asked in what types of courses did the participants teach the subject of public speaking. The results of this item are found in Summary Table 4.

Summary Table 4
Types of Courses in which Public
Speaking has been Taught by the Participants

An introductory public speaking course	22 of 28	78%
An introductory hybrid communication course	23 of 28	82%
An advanced public speaking course	11 of 28	39%
A business and professional public speaking course	11 of 28	39%
Other types of communication courses	6 of 28	21%

Item 5 asked how many sections of courses each participant had taught that contained the subject of public speaking. The results of this item are found in Summary Table 5.

Summary Table 5
Number of Sections of Courses
Taught that Contained Public Speaking
(N=27; One person did not respond)

1 to 3	3	11%	26 to 30	0	0%
4 to 6	4	15%	31 to 35	1	04%
7 to 9	5	18%	36 to 40	1	04%
10 to 15	6	22%	41 to 45	0	0%
16 to 20	2	07%	46 to 49	0	0%
21 to 25	1	04%	Over fifty	4	15%
				27	100%

Item 6 asked the number of years that each participant had taught courses that contain public speaking. The results of this item are found in Summary Table 6.

Summary Table 6
Number of years that each Participant has
Taught Courses that contain Public Speaking

1	4	14%	8	2	07%
2	2	07%	9	0	0%
3	5	18%	10	1	04%
4	2	07%	11 to 15	5	18%
5	2	07%	16 to 20	0	0%
6	3	11%	26 to 30	0	0%
7	0	0%	Over 31 years	2	07%
				28	100%

Instrument Design

The survey instrument was composed of three parts. Part one was designed to gather demographic data and consisted of six questions on one page. The demographic data collected included: (1) academic status, (2) academic rank, (3) tenure status, (4) types of courses in which participants taught public speaking, (5) number of sections of courses in which participants have taught public speaking, and (6) the number of years participants have taught public speaking. The purpose of collecting this data was to establish a general profile of the participants surveyed.

Part two was designed to gather information regarding the emphasis that the participants place on content and delivery when teaching public speaking, when delivering oral critiques of speeches, and when providing written critiques of speeches. It consisted of 22 items on two pages. Items 1 through 18 consisted of a list of public speaking topics related to either content or delivery. Six of the items listed related to content (functions of a conclusion; functions of an introduction; organizational patterns; outlining the speech; persuasive reasoning; and supporting evidence), six related to physical delivery choices (dress and appearance; eye contact; facial expressions; gestures; physical movement; and posture), and six related to vocal delivery choices (enunciation/pronunciation; projection; rate; using pauses; vocal variety; and volume).

These topics were presented in alphabetical order. Participants were asked to respond to a Likert type scale ranging from one to seven to indicate where they spent the least amount of time (one), to where they spent the most amount of time (seven) for each topic. Participants were asked to make this distinction for each topic when teaching public speaking, when delivering oral critiques of speeches and when providing written critiques of speeches. The purpose of collecting this data was to determine how much time instructors perceived that they spent on specific topics related to content and delivery when teaching, and giving oral and written critiques.

Items 19, 20 and 21 asked participants to fill in blanks to indicate the percentage of emphasis that they placed on content and delivery when teaching public speaking, when delivering oral critiques of speeches, and when providing written critiques of speeches. The purpose of gathering this data was to provide a more general set of data than would be gathered in items 1 through 18 on how instructors perceived that they emphasized

content and delivery in teaching, and giving oral and written critiques, and that could be used for comparative purposes and to triangulate findings of the study.

Item 22 asked participants to indicate with an X which statement they considered true: content is more important than delivery; delivery is more important than content; or content and delivery are equally important. Part three provided an opportunity for participants to make any additional written comments on the topic of content and delivery in public speaking. The purpose of gathering this data was to provide another general set of data for the purposes of comparison and triangulation.

A copy of the survey questionnaire is contained in the appendix of this paper.

Survey Results and Data

Survey Data

Items 1 through 18 asked participants to indicate the amount of time that they spent on 18 different topics related to speech content and delivery when teaching, when giving students oral critiques of speeches and when giving students written critiques of speeches.

The responses as presented in the following tables have been compressed and are tabled according to category, and to indicate: those who did not respond; those who spent a less than average time on a topic, an average amount of time on a topic; and a greater than average amount of time on a topic.

The original data are presented in the appendix of this paper.

Please note: Due to having rounded numbers up or down, not all percentages will actually add up to 100. Some may add up to 99. Some may add up to 101.

Summary Table 7 contains the results of the topics related to teaching and speech content (Items 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 15).

Summary Table 7
How much time is given to each
public speaking topic when teaching:
Content related topics
N = 28; % = 100

5. Functions of a conclusion			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
1	3	5	19
04%	11%	18%	69%
6. Functions of an introduction			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
1	2	5	20
04%	07%	18%	71%
8. Organizational patterns			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
0	1	2	25
0%	04%	07%	89%
9. Outlining the speech			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
0	6	2	20
0%	21%	07%	71%
10. Persuasive Reasoning			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
2	3	3	20
07%	11%	11%	71%
15. Supporting Evidence			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
0	0	2	26
0%	0%	07%	93%

Summary Table 8 contains the results of the topics related to teaching and physical delivery choices (Items 1, 3, 4, 7, 11, and 12).

Summary Table 8
How much time is given to each
public speaking topic when teaching:
Physical Delivery Topics
N = 28; % = 100

1. Dress and appearance			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
2	23	2	1
07%	82%	07%	04%
3. Eye Contact			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
2	8	5	13
07%	29%	18%	46%
4. Facial Expressions			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
3	20	0	5
11%	71%	0%	18%
7. Gestures			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
3	16	1	8
11%	57%	04%	28%
11. Physical Movement			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
3	14	4	7
11%	50%	14%	25%
12. Posture			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	16	4	4
14%	57%	14%	14%

Summary Table 9 contains the results of the topics related to teaching and vocal delivery choices (Items 2, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18).

Summary Table 9
How much time is given to each
public speaking topic when teaching:
Vocal Delivery Topics
N = 28:% = 100

2. Enunciation/Pronunciation			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
2	19	2	5
07%	68%	07%	18%
13. Projection			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	17	3	4
14%	61%	11%	14%
14. Rate			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	16	3	5
14%	57%	11%	18%
16. Using pauses			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
2	18	4	4
07%	64%	14%	14%
17. Vocal Variety			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
3	16	1	8
11%	57%	04%	30%
18. Volume			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
2	19	3	4
07%	68%	11%	14%

Summary Table 10 contains the results of the topics related to oral critiques and speech content (Items 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 15).

Summary Table 10
How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving oral critiques
Content related topics
N = 28; % = 100

5. Functions of a conclusion			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
7	9	2	10
25%	33%	07%	35%
6. Functions of an introduction			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
6	10	1	11
21%	35%	04%	39%
8. Organizational patterns			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
5	6	0	17
18%	21%	0%	61%
9. Outlining the speech			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	6	3	11
29%	21%	11%	39%
10. Persuasive Reasoning			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	7	1	12
29%	25%	04%	42%
15. Supporting Evidence			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
5	5	6	12
18%	18%	21%	43%

Summary Table 11 contains the results of the topics related to oral critiques and physical delivery choices (Items 1, 3, 4, 7, 11, and 12).

Summary Table 11
How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving oral critiques:
Physical Delivery Choices
N = 28; % = 100

1. Dress and appearance			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
9	18	0	1
32%	64%	0%	04%
3. Eye Contact			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	4	2	14
30%	14%	07%	50%
4. Facial Expressions			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
7	14	3	4
25%	50%	11%	14%
7. Gestures			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
6	14	0	8
21%	50%	0%	28%
11. Physical Movement			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	11	1	8
28%	39%	04%	28%
12. Posture			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	15	2	3
28%	54%	07%	11%

Summary Table 12 contains the results of the topics related to oral critiques and vocal delivery choices (Items 2, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18).

Summary Table 12
How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving oral critiques
Vocal Delivery Choices
N = 28; % = 100

2. Enunciation/Pronunciation			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
9	14	2	3
32%	50%	07%	11%
13. Projection			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	14	3	3
30%	50%	11%	11%
14. Rate			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	13	0	7
30%	46%	0%	25%
16. Using pauses			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	12	4	4
30%	43%	14%	14%
17. Vocal Variety			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	12	1	7
30%	43%	03%	25%
18. Volume			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
8	13	1	6
30%	46%	13%	21%

Summary Table 13 contains the results of the topics related to written critiques and speech content (Items 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 15).

Summary Table 13
How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving written critiques:
Content related Topics
N = 28; % = 100

5. Functions of a conclusion			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	3	5	16
14%	11%	18%	57%
6. Functions of an introduction			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	2	4	18
14%	07%	14%	64%
8. Organizational patterns			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
2	5	1	20
07%	18%	04%	71%
9. Outlining the speech			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
5	5	2	16
18%	18%	07%	57%
10. Persuasive Reasoning			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
3	6	1	18
11%	21%	04%	64%
15. Supporting Evidence			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
2	1	3	22
07%	04%	11%	78%

Summary Table 14 contains the results of the topics related to written critiques and physical delivery choices (Items 1, 3, 4, 7, 11, and 12).

Summary Table 14
How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving written critiques:
Physical Delivery Choices
N = 28; % = 100

1. Dress and appearance			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
5	20	3	0
18%	71%	11%	0%
3. Eye Contact			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
3	7	4	14
11%	25%	14%	50%
4. Facial Expressions			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
6	16	3	3
21%	57%	11%	11%
7. Gestures			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	14	3	7
14%	50%	11%	25%
11. Physical Movement			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
5	12	6	5
18%	43%	21%	18%
12. Posture			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
6	14	4	4
21%	50%	14%	14%

Summary Table 15 contains the results of the topics related to written critiques and vocal delivery choices (Items 2, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 18).

Summary Table 15
How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving written critiques:
Vocal Delivery Choices
N = 28; % = 100

2. Enunciation/Pronunciation			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	15	4	5
14%	54%	14%	18%
13. Projection			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	16	3	5
14%	57%	11%	18%
14. Rate			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	13	2	9
14%	46%	07%	32%
16. Using pauses			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
5	13	4	6
18%	46%	14%	21%
17. Vocal Variety			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	12	1	11
14%	43%	04%	39%
18. Volume			
Did not answer	Less than average	Average	Greater than average
4	15	2	7
14%	54%	07%	25%

Items 19 through 21 asked the participants to indicate by percentages how much emphasis they placed on content and delivery when teaching, giving students oral critiques and giving students written critiques. The information has been compressed to indicate those who give content more than 50% of the emphasis, those who give content and delivery each 50% of the emphasis, and those who give content less than 50% of the emphasis.

Summary Table 16 contains the results of Items 19 through 21. The original data are presented in the appendix of this paper.

Summary Table 16

Emphasis on content versus delivery by percentage when teaching, giving oral critiques and giving written critiques

N=27; One person did not respond

Ratio: Content/ Delivery	Question 19 Teaching		Question 20 Oral Critiques		Question 21 Written Critiques	
Content Greater than 50/50	20	74%	17	63%	17	63%
50/50	4	15%	9	33%	8	30%
Content Less than 50/50	3	11%	1	04%	2	07%
	27	100%	27	100%	27	100%

Item 22 asked the participants to indicate which is more important: content or delivery. The results of Item 22 are presented in Summary Table 17.

Summary Table 17
Which is more important: Content or Delivery?
N=27; One person did not respond

Content is more important in public speaking than delivery:	13	48%
Delivery is more important in public speaking then content:	2	07%
Content and delivery are equally important in public speaking:	12	45%
	27	100%

Analysis of the Data

Items 19 through 22 were designed to provide a series of baselines with which to describe which aspect of public speaking, content or delivery, instructors placed more emphasis on while teaching, and giving oral and written critiques. Toward this end, the results of item 22 provide some very interesting information, and it is this item that we will analyze first.

Item 22
Summary Table 17

Only two people (7% of those surveyed) believe that delivery is more important than content in public speaking. But, there is an almost exactly even split between those that say that content is more important (13 respondents, 48%), and those that say content and delivery are equally important (12 respondents, 45%). This demonstrates that a clear majority of these respondents (93%) do not consider delivery to be of major importance over content in the public speaking process.

However, this virtual tie between those who believe that content is more important than delivery, and those who believe that content and delivery are equally important, is very significant for the topic of delivery in public speaking. It indicates that delivery still has a significant place in the

process of public speaking to a significant number of instructors, despite few people giving delivery more weight in the public speaking process than content.

At this point, based on this data, this study can only conclude that a virtually equal number of instructors believe that content is more important in public speaking than delivery, and that content and delivery are equally important in public speaking. One particular perspective does not win out in this case. Perhaps items 19 through 21 can contribute to breaking this virtual tie.

Items 19 - 21
Summary Table 16

Items 19 through 21 were designed to provide a baseline with which to describe how much emphasis instructors placed on content and delivery within the three contexts examined in this study: teaching; providing oral critiques; and providing written critiques. The information provided in the results from items 19 through 21 is very interesting, particularly when compared with the results from item 22.

Twenty (74%) of the respondents to item 19 indicated that they give content more than 50% of the emphasis when teaching. Seventeen (63%) of the respondents to item 20 indicated that they give content more than 50% of the emphasis when giving oral critiques of speeches to students. Seventeen (63%) of the respondents to item 21 indicated that they give content more than 50% of the emphasis when giving written critiques.

This information is inconsistent with the virtual tie that occurred in item 22. While item 22 indicates that 48% of the instructors surveyed believe that content is more important than delivery, and that 45% believe that content and delivery are equally important, items 19 through 21 clearly indicate that a significant majority of instructors give more weight to content than delivery when teaching, when giving oral critiques, and when giving written critiques.

Items 19 through 22 contradict the results of item 22, and break the tie between those who give more weight to content and delivery, and those who give equal weight to content and delivery. In items 19 through 22 only four respondents (15%) indicated that they give equal weight to content and delivery when teaching; nine (33%) indicated that they give

equal weight to content and delivery when giving oral critiques; and 8 (30%) indicated that they give equal weight to content and delivery when giving written critiques. So, it would seem that, while 45% of those surveyed indicated in item 22 that they believe that content and delivery are equally important in public speaking, a lesser number are able to actually follow that belief in practice. Items 19 though 21 indicate that in practice, a significant majority of public speaking instructors place more emphasis on content than delivery in all three categories examined.

Items 19 though 21 provide another interesting insight into the emphasis that is placed on content and delivery in these three categories. The number of instructors who place an equal emphasis on content and delivery doubles when we go from teaching to oral and written critiques. Four (15%) of those surveyed indicated that they place 50% of the emphasis on content and 50% of the emphasis on delivery when teaching. Nine (33%) of those surveyed indicated that they place 50% of the emphasis on content and 50% of the emphasis on delivery when giving oral critiques. And, eight (30%) of those surveyed indicated that they place 50% of the emphasis on content and 50% of the emphasis on delivery when giving written critiques. It is interesting to note that the numbers in this category increase significantly for both of the critiques.

It is also significant to note that there is consistency regarding those who give more weight to delivery than content. In items 19 through 21 only three instructors (11%) give content less than 50% of their time when teaching; only one (04%) gives content less than 50% of her or his time when giving oral critiques; and only two (07%) give content less than 50% of their time when giving written critiques. These statistics are consistent with item 22.

Items 1 through 18: Teaching
Research Question One

Items 1 though 18 were designed to investigate how much time instructors spend on specific topics related to content and delivery in the three categories of teaching, delivering oral critiques, and delivering written critiques.

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on content related topics while teaching (Summary Table 7), we see that a greater than average amount of time is consistently spent on all six of the

content topics by a significant percentage of those surveyed: functions of a conclusion; functions of an introduction; organizational patterns; outlining the speech; persuasive reasoning; and supporting evidence. The percentage of instructors who spend a greater than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 69% to 93%. These figures constitute a clear majority in the case of each of these topics.

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on physical delivery related topics while teaching (Summary Table 8), we see that a less than average amount of time is consistently spent on five of the six physical delivery topics by a significant percentage of those surveyed: dress and appearance; facial expressions; gestures; physical movement; and posture. The percentage of instructors who spend a less than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 50% to 82%. One exception in this category was eye contact. Only 29% of the instructors surveyed spent a less than average amount of time on this topic. For the most part though, instructors spend a less than average amount of time on these delivery topics.

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on vocal delivery related topics while teaching (Summary Table 9), we see that a less than average amount of time is consistently spent on all six of the vocal delivery topics by a significant percentage of those surveyed: enunciation/pronunciation; projection; rate; using pauses; vocal variety; volume. The percentage of instructors who spend a less than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 57% to 68%. These figures constitute a majority in the case of each of these topics.

These figures support the conclusion that has been drawn thus far from item 19 that indicates that instructors do emphasize content over delivery in teaching public speaking. This conclusion is supported even further by the fact that some participants did not respond to some of the categories in items 1 though 18, leaving them blank. However, this consistently seemed to indicate that the person did not spend any time at all on that particular topic, rather than that the person did not have a response for that item. This was born out by several written notes left by participants. When these figures are added to the less than average responses for the physical and vocal delivery topics, the percentages then indicate as strong a majority as was indicated in the content topics category.

Based upon the results of this survey, the answer to research question 1 (Do instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content or delivery when teaching?) is that instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content than delivery when teaching.

Items 1 through 18: Oral Critiques
Research Question Two

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on content related topics while giving oral critiques teaching (Summary Table 10), we initially see more of a balance between those who spend a greater amount of time on content topics during oral critiques, and those who spend a lesser amount of time on them, with an apparent slight edge to those who spend a greater amount of time on content topics during oral critiques. The percentage of instructors who spend a greater than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 35% to 43% in five of the six content topics. The percentage of instructors who spend a lesser than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 18% to 35% in the six content topics.

However, we must again take into account the fact that in this category several participants did not respond to these topics. If we can correctly interpret that the individuals who did not respond, actually do not refer to these topics during oral critiques, then the scale shifts significantly. In the case of the topics functions of a conclusion, functions of an introduction, outlining the speech, and persuasive reasoning, a significant majority of the respondents then spend less than average time on those topics during oral critiques. A majority of respondents do still spend a greater than average time on the topic of organizational patterns, and the spread is relatively even between the two categories on the topic of supporting evidence. The topic of supporting evidence also stands out when looking at the category of an average amount of time. The other topics in the category of average show a range of 0% (0 participants) to 11% (3 participants) in responses. The response of average in supporting evidence received six responses (21%).

The data supports the conclusion that the instructors in this study clearly spend a greater than average amount of time on the topic of organizational patterns when giving oral critiques. The data further shows that the topic of supporting evidence also receives a significant amount of time in oral critiques, and that the topics functions of a conclusion, functions of an

introduction, outlining the speech, and persuasive reasoning receive a less than average amount of time in oral critiques.

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on physical delivery related topics while giving oral critiques teaching (Summary Table 11), we see that a less than average amount of time is consistently spent on five of the six physical delivery topics by a clear majority of the respondents: dress and appearance; facial expressions; gestures; physical movement; and posture. There is an even stronger statistical significance if we interpret blank responses as not addressing the topic at all. The percentage of instructors who spend a less than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 39% to 64%. Those who did not answer in these topics ranged from 21% to 32%.

The data supports the conclusion that the instructors in this study clearly spend a less than average amount of time on the topics of dress and appearance; facial expressions; gestures; physical movement; and posture when giving oral critiques.

One clear exception in this category was eye contact. Only 14% of the instructors surveyed spent a less than average amount of time on this topic, and 30% of the respondents did not answer this category. But, 50% of the participants indicated that they spend a greater than average amount of time on this topic, and 07% reported that they spend an average amount of time on this topic. The data indicates that this physical delivery topic receives the most attention in oral critiques.

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on vocal delivery related topics while giving oral critiques teaching (Summary Table 12), we again see that a less than average amount of time is consistently spent on all six physical delivery topics by a clear majority of the respondents: enunciation/pronunciation; projection; rate; using pauses; vocal variety; and volume. And again, there is an even stronger statistical significance if we interpret blank responses as not addressing the topic at all. The percentage of instructors who spend a less than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 43% to 50%. Those who did not answer in these topics ranged from 30% to 32%.

The data supports the conclusion that the instructors in this study clearly spend a less than average amount of time on all the topics of vocal delivery choices when giving oral critiques.

These figures support the conclusion that has been drawn from item 20 that indicates that instructors emphasize content over delivery when giving students oral critiques.

However, these figures do not support, or reflect, the increase of those participants who indicated that they spend an equal amount of time on content and delivery issues when giving oral critiques that is noted in question 20.

Based upon the results of this survey, the answer to research question 2 (Do instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content or delivery when giving oral critiques?) is that instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content than delivery when giving oral critiques.

Items 1 through 18: Written Critiques
Research Question Three

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on content related topics while giving written critiques teaching (Summary Table 13), we see figures that are more like those that we observed in the data from the teaching category. We see here again that a greater than average amount of time is consistently spent on all six of the content topics by a significant percentage of those surveyed. The percentage of instructors who spend a greater than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 57% to 78% in all six of the content topics. The percentage of instructors who spend a lesser than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 04% to 21% in the six content topics.

Even taking into account the fact that in this category several participants did not respond to these topics does not add much weight to the statistical significance of those who spend less than average time on content during written critiques. The topics in this category show a range of 07% to 18% in responses.

The data supports the conclusion that the instructors in this study clearly spend a greater than average amount of time on content related topics when giving written critiques. The data also indicates that the topics of

supporting evidence and organizational patterns appear to receive the largest amount of time compared to the other four topics in written critiques.

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on physical delivery related topics while giving written critiques teaching (Summary Table 14), we again see that a less than average amount of time is consistently spent on five of the six physical delivery topics by a clear majority of the respondents: dress and appearance; facial expressions; gestures; physical movement; and posture. And, that again there is an even stronger statistical significance if we interpret blank responses as not addressing the topic at all. The percentage of instructors who spend a less than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 43% to 71%. Those who did not answer in these topics ranged from 11% to 21%.

The data supports the conclusion that the instructors in this study clearly spend a less than average amount of time on the topics of dress and appearance; facial expressions; gestures; physical movement; and posture when giving oral critiques.

One clear exception in this category again was eye contact. Only 25% of the instructors surveyed spent a less than average amount of time on this topic, and 11% of the respondents did not answer this category. And again, 50% of the participants indicated that they spend a greater than average amount of time on this topic, and 14% reported that they spend an average amount of time on this topic. The data indicates that this physical delivery topic receives the most attention in oral critiques.

In this category, a specific hierarchy of preference seems to emerge, with eye contact receiving the most attention from instructors, followed by gestures, physical movement, posture, facial expressions, and with dress and appearance clearly receiving the least attention of instructors in written critiques.

In examining the data that describes how much time instructors spend on vocal delivery related topics while giving written critiques teaching (Summary Table 15), we again see that a less than average amount of time is consistently spent on all six physical delivery topics by a clear majority of the respondents, but that there is more balance here than in the two previous categories described. And again, there is an even stronger

statistical significance if we interpret blank responses as not addressing the topic at all. The percentage of instructors who spend a less than average amount of time on these topics ranged from 43% to 57%. Those who did not answer in these topics ranged from 14% to 18%.

The data supports the conclusion that the instructors in this study clearly spend a less than average amount of time on all the topics of vocal delivery choices when giving written critiques. Vocal variety and rate did appear to receive the most attention among these vocal delivery choice topics.

These figures support the conclusion that has been drawn from item 21 that indicates that instructors emphasize content over delivery when giving students written critiques.

However, these figures do not support, or reflect, the increase of those participants who indicated that they spend an equal amount of time on content and delivery issues when giving written critiques that is noted in question 21.

Based upon the results of this survey, the answer to research question 3 (Do instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content or delivery when giving written critiques?) is that instructors of public speaking place more emphasis on content than delivery when giving written critiques.

Research Question Four

The last remaining research question is: Do the perceptions of public speaking instructors regarding how much emphasis they place on content and delivery match the actual emphasis that they place on content and delivery? It does not appear that this study can provide a clear cut answer to this question.

Research Questions one through three of this study tell us that in actual practice, a significant majority of the participants of this survey do spend a greater amount of time on content related topics when teaching public speaking, and when giving oral and written critiques, than they spend on delivery related items during the same pursuits.

Items 19 through 21 of the survey questionnaire tell us that the participants of this survey believe that they place more than 50% of their emphasis on content over delivery when they teach, and give oral and written critiques.

Comparing these conclusions indicates that the answer to research question four is yes, the perceptions of public speaking instructors regarding how much emphasis they place on content and delivery do match the actual emphasis that they place on content and delivery.

But, item 22 of the survey questionnaire tells us that 48% of the participants in this study believe that content is more important than delivery in public speaking. It also tells us that 45% of the participants in this study believe that content and delivery are equally important in public speaking. If that is interpreted to mean that those instructors think that they place an equal amount of time and emphasis on content and delivery, then the answer to research question four is yes and no.

Yes, the perceptions of 48% of the public speaking instructors surveyed regarding how much emphasis they place on content and delivery do match the actual emphasis that they place on content and delivery.

No, the perceptions of 45% of the public speaking instructors surveyed regarding how much emphasis they place on content and delivery do not match the actual emphasis that they place on content and delivery.

Thus, this study cannot provide a clear cut answer to research question four.

Limitations of the Study

There are four factors that have been noted that limit the reliability of this study. First, because this is a pilot study, it was only administered at two institutions. This does not provide a wide profile of responses. This first factor contributed to the second factor that limits this study, and that is the fact that it is based on an overall low number of responses. The third factor that limits this study is the fact that it is based on a low number of responses from experienced, seasoned faculty members. Over half of the respondents are graduate teaching assistants. A fourth factor that limits this study is that items one through eighteen in the data survey need a "Do not spend any time at all on this topic" response category. All of these

factors demonstrate the reason that this is pilot study and it is anticipated that these factors will be eliminated in further studies on this topic.

Conclusion

The results of this pilot study indicate that the questions raised are worthy of pursuit, and they also raise some additional interesting questions. The overall question of where we place our emphasis as teachers, on content or delivery, has significant implications for what we teach our students and how we teach it to them. It also potentially has implications regarding our own backgrounds and how we were taught. Certainly it has implications for the future of public speaking education and pedagogy. I hope to pursue these issues, and others, in future study and research, and I hope that others will also examine these issues in their own research agendi.

Appendix A

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when teaching: Content related topics

DNA = Did Not Answer

5. Functions of a conclusion							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	0	1	2	5	5	7	7

6. Functions of an introduction							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	0	1	1	5	5	5	10

8. Organizational patterns							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0	0	0	1	2	5	13	7

9. Outlining the speech							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0	0	3	3	2	6	6	8

10. Persuasive Reasoning							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	0	1	2	3	5	7	8

15. Supporting Evidence							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
0	0	0	0	2	7	10	9

Appendix B

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when teaching: Physical Delivery Choices

DNA = Did Not Answer

1. Dress and appearance							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2 07%	12 43%	9 32%	2 07%	2 07%	1 04%	0 0%	0 0%
3. Eye Contact							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	1	4	3	5	7	3	3
4. Facial Expressions							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	4	8	8	0	5	0	0
7. Gestures							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	1	9	6	1	5	3	0
11. Physical Movement							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	3	6	5	4	3	3	1
12. Posture							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	6	7	3	4	2	2	0

Appendix C

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when teaching: Vocal Delivery Choices

DNA = Did Not Answer

2. Enunciation/Pronunciation							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2 07%	5 18%	8 28%	6 22%	2 07%	4 14%	1 04%	0 0%

13. Projection							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	6	6	5	3	3	1	0

14. Rate							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	2	8	6	3	5	0	0

16. Using pauses							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	5	8	5	4	1	2	1

17. Vocal Variety							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	4	7	5	1	6	1	1

18. Volume							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	6	8	5	3	2	2	0

Appendix D

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving oral critiques:
Content related topics

DNA = Did Not Answer

5. Functions of a conclusion							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	3	5	1	2	1	3	6

6. Functions of an introduction							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	4	4	2	1	1	3	7

8. Organizational patterns							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	3	1	2	0	6	8	3

9. Outlining the speech							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	3	2	1	3	3	2	6

10. Persuasive Reasoning							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	2	2	3	1	2	5	5

15. Supporting Evidence							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	2	1	2	6	3	4	5

Appendix E

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving oral critiques:
Physical Delivery Choices

DNA = Did Not Answer

1. Dress and appearance							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	10	6	2	0	0	0	1

3. Eye Contact							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	2	1	1	2	8	4	2

4. Facial Expressions							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7	7	3	4	3	3	1	0

7. Gestures							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	5	4	5	0	4	4	0

11. Physical Movement							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	2	6	3	1	2	5	1

12. Posture							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	7	5	3	2	1	2	0

Appendix F

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving oral critiques:
Vocal Delivery Choices

DNA = Did Not Answer

2. Enunciation/Pronunciation

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9	6	6	2	2	1	2	0

13. Projection

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	5	4	5	3	2	0	1

14. Rate

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	3	4	6	0	4	2	1

16. Using pauses

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	4	5	3	4	1	2	1

17. Vocal Variety

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	4	4	4	1	5	2	0

18. Volume

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	5	3	5	1	3	2	1

Appendix G

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving written critiques:
Content related topics

DNA = Did Not Answer

5. Functions of a conclusion

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	0	2	1	5	5	4	7

6. Functions of an introduction

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	0	1	1	4	5	6	7

8. Organizational patterns

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	0	3	2	1	4	11	5

9. Outlining the speech

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	1	3	1	2	6	3	7

10. Persuasive Reasoning

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	0	1	5	1	5	6	7

15. Supporting Evidence

DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	0	0	1	3	5	9	8

Appendix II

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving written critiques:
Physical Delivery Choices

DNA = Did Not Answer

1. Dress and appearance							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	13	5	2	3	0	0	0

3. Eye Contact							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	2	3	2	4	6	5	3

4. Facial Expressions							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	6	3	7	3	2	1	0

7. Gestures							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	2	4	8	3	5	2	0

11. Physical Movement							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	2	4	6	6	3	1	1

12. Posture							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	6	5	3	4	3	1	0

Appendix I

How much time is given to each public speaking topic when giving written critiques:
Vocal Delivery Choices

DNA = Did Not Answer

2. Enunciation/Pronunciation							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	5	7	3	4	3	2	0

13. Projection							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	5	6	5	3	1	2	1

14. Rate							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	1	7	5	2	5	3	1

16. Using pauses							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	4	6	3	4	2	3	1

17. Vocal Variety							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	4	3	5	1	7	4	0

18. Volume							
DNA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	5	4	6	2	3	3	1

Appendix J

Questions 19 through 21: Emphasis on content versus delivery by percentage when teaching, giving oral critiques and giving written critiques:

N=27; One person did not respond

Ratio: Con/Del	Question 19 Teaching		Question 20 Oral Critiques		Question 21 Written Critiques	
90/10	2	07%	1	04%	1	04%
85/15	1	04%	1	04%	1	04%
80/20	7	27%	6	22%	5	18%
75/25	2	07%	1	04%	1	04%
70/30	3	11%	2	07%	4	15%
65/35	3	11%	1	04%	2	07%
60/40	2	07%	5	18%	3	11%
50/50	4	15%	9	33%	8	30%
40/60	2	07%	0	0%	2	07%
35/65	0	0%	1	04%	0	0%
30/70	1	04%	0	0%	0	0%
	27	100%	27	100%	27	100%

Appendix K

Public Speaking Content/Delivery Questionnaire

2/1/98

Dear Colleague,

My name is Paul Siddens, and I teach in the Communication Studies Department at the University of Northern Iowa. I am conducting a study that examines how instructors teach and discuss speech content and delivery issues with students in class. The results of this study will be presented in a paper at this year's Central States Communication Association Conference.

If you have taught public speaking in at least one or more of the courses that you have conducted, and, if you have critiqued speeches in class at least once that your students have delivered in your courses, please take a few minutes to fill out this questionnaire.

If you teach at the University of Iowa, please return this questionnaire by 2/25/98 to the department mailbox of Ph.D. student Valerie Peterson in the Becker Communication Studies Building.

If you teach at the University of Northern Iowa please return this questionnaire by 2/25/98 to the faculty mailbox of Paul Siddens in CAC 268.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this questionnaire.

Section I: Demographic Information

1. I am: _____ a Masters student
   _____ a Ph.D. student
   _____ a part-time faculty member
   _____ a full-time faculty member

2. I am: _____ a Graduate Teaching Assistant
   _____ an Instructor or Adjunct
   _____ an Assistant Professor
   _____ an Associate Professor
   _____ a Full Professor

3. I am: _____ Untenured _____ Tenured

4. I have taught public speaking in one or more sections of:
   (Please check all of those that apply)
   _____ an introductory public speaking course
   _____ an introductory hybrid communication course
   _____ an advanced public speaking course
   _____ a business and professional public speaking course
   _____ Other (Please specify: _____)

5. I have taught the following number of sections of courses that contain public speaking (approximately):

_____ 1 to 3	_____ 16 to 20	_____ 36 to 40
_____ 4 to 6	_____ 21 to 25	_____ 41 to 45
_____ 7 to 9	_____ 26 to 30	_____ 46 to 49
_____ 10 to 15	_____ 31 to 35	_____ Over fifty sections

6. I have taught courses that contain public speaking for the following number of years (approximately):

_____ 1	_____ 6	_____ 11 to 15
_____ 2	_____ 7	_____ 16 to 20
_____ 3	_____ 8	_____ 21 to 25
_____ 4	_____ 9	_____ 26 to 30
_____ 5	_____ 10	_____ Over thirty one years

40

Section II: Survey Data

Items 1 though 18 below form a list of topics that are used to teach content and physical and vocal delivery in public speaking. Please use the scale below to indicate to the best of your ability for each category the amount of time that you give to each topic when teaching, when giving oral critiques in class, and in written critiques that you return to your students.

I spend the least amount of time on this topic						I spend the most amount of time on this topic
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

If you do not spend any time at all on a topic please indicate that with an "X"

Public Speaking Topic	Teaching	Oral Critiques	Written Critiques
1. Dress and appearance			
2. Enunciation/Pronunciation			
3. Eye Contact			
4. Facial Expressions			
5. Functions of a conclusion			
6. Functions of an introduction			
7. Gestures			
8. Organizational patterns			
9. Outlining the speech			
10. Persuasive Reasoning			
11. Physical Movement			
12. Posture			
13. Projection			
14. Rate			
15. Supporting Evidence			
16. Using pauses			
17. Vocal Variety			
18. Volume			

Please fill in the blanks to respond to items 19, 20 and 21:

19. When teaching my students public speaking, I place about _____% of the emphasis on content, and about _____% of the emphasis on delivery. (The two numbers inserted should add up to 100%.)

20. When critiquing my students speeches in class, I place about _____% of the emphasis on content, and about _____% of the emphasis on delivery. (The two numbers inserted should add up to 100%.)

21. When providing written critiques to students for their speeches, I place about _____% of the emphasis on content, and about _____% of the emphasis on delivery. (The two numbers inserted should add up to 100%.)

Please mark with an X the statement that you think is the most true to respond to item 22:

22. _____ Content is more important in public speaking than delivery.
_____ Delivery is more important in public speaking then content.
_____ Content and delivery are equally important in public speaking.

Section III: Written Responses

If you wish to write down any comments or observations regarding how you teach students about content and delivery in public speaking, and/or about the balance that should exist between these two topics in our courses, please feel free to use the remaining space on this page and on the other side of this page to share your thoughts with me.

Thank you again for taking time to fill out this questionnaire.